

0047660
049340

Oregon

DEPARTMENT OF

HUMAN

RESOURCES

HEALTH DIVISION

July 14, 1997

Robert Stewart
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550- (HO-12)
Richland, WA 99352



Dear Mr. Stewart:

On behalf of the Oregon Health Division, I appreciated the opportunity to participate in the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) information meeting held on May 21, 1997 at the State Office Building in Portland.

The Phase I (screening assessment) report showed some areas of Columbia River involvement. As the public health agency for the State of Oregon, we must emphasize activities that prevent further Columbia River contamination. We strongly urge the CRCIA to maximize its efforts to characterize the risks from the Hanford reservation and plan remedial actions to preclude additional contamination of the vados zone. Elimination of contaminants to the river will be the most effective strategy to protect the river and protect public health and safety in this vital area of the Columbia River.

Also, it appears that further detailed study of future potential human health effects may be more appropriate after characterization of contamination risks and immediate preventive clean up are completed on the Hanford site. The additional data from the site characterization may well add significantly to the usefulness of further study. Data from the Division's Columbia River Environmental Radiological Program may also be useful during this latter phase.

We look forward to working more closely with the CRCIA Team in the future.

Sincerely,

Elinor C. Hall, MPH
Administrator

ECH:sd

RECEIVED

JUL 21 1997

DOE-RL/DIS

John A. Kitzhaber
Governor



800 NE Oregon Street # 21
Portland, OR 97232-2162
(503) 731-4030 Emergency
(503) 252-7978 TDD
After Hours

Name: Laura Chenet Leonard/Narda Tolentino

049340

Address: OHD/EOI 800 NE Oregon St M.S. 705

City/State: Portland, Oregon

Zip Code: 97232

Home Phone #: _____ Work Phone #: 731-4025

Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment:

1. Was there sufficient material to allow focus group members to understand the issue and were documents easy to understand?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided
2. Were speakers knowledgeable and sensitive to different views and opinions?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided
3. Was the meeting efficiently run, productive, and worth your time?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided
4. How can state and federal agencies better identify potential focus group members for future meetings on Hanford issues?

Recommendations: _____

1. Request to place article in Hanford Health Information Newsletter.
2. Persons who live in highly vulnerable neighborhoods.
3. Agency people need to go out to communities.

Check the appropriate box(s)

- ☐ I'd like more information on...
- ☐ I'd like to comment on...
- ☐ I'm concerned about... and it wasn't addressed in your presentation.

Comments: _____
